DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 699 AL 002 674

AUTHOR Norris, William E.
TITLE Teaching English as a Second Language: A Survey of 1969, a Projection for 1970.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.
PUB DATE Apr 70
NOTE 52p.; Prepared as part of "Information Analysis Planning Effort for the Contract Year 1969/70, Final Report"

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies, Bilingualism, *English (Second Language), Information Sources, *Language Instruction, Linguistics, Linguistic Theory, Psycholinguistics, Reference Materials, Research, Sociolinguistics, *Surveys, *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The author's purpose in this paper is to survey what has been done in 1969 in the field of TESL as it shows itself in published and unpublished literature, research activities and other information sources, and to identify educationally significant trends, topics and needs. Not intended to be bibliographical (although it concludes with an 86-item reference listing), it is intended to serve as an outline of important present activities and developments and major gaps in knowledge. The first part of the paper outlines and evaluates current trends in the field of English for speakers of other languages; the second part discusses in some detail current topics in TESL research and development. (AMM)

ED 044699

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE: A survey of 1969, a projection for 1970.

by William E. Norris, University of Pittsburgh

(Prepared for the CAL/ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, April 1970 as part of the Information Analysis Planning Effort for the Contract Year 1969/70, Final Report.)

Introduction.

The teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) might at first thought appear to be displaced in the ERIC system, attached as it is to the CAL Clearinghouse for Linguistics, rather than the NCTE Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English or the MLA Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. But English teaching in the United States ordinarily means teaching pupils who are native speakers of the language: it is "mother tongue" teaching. More logically, then, teaching English as a foreign or second language (TEFL or TESL) should belong under the same clearinghouse roof as the modern foreign languages (MFLs), French, Spanish and German, because there is, to be sure, an undeniable similarity of activities and goals, at least in beginning level foreign language classes, no matter what the language. Indeed, the audio-lingual method of foreign language teaching which became so widespread in MFL classrooms during the past decade and a half was strongly influenced by new procedures and techniques first tried out in American TEFL classrooms in the early 1940's. But these developments, as

AL 002 674

we shall see, were and are strongly influenced by linguistic science, and TEFL became inextricably tied to linguistics as its teaching methodology evolved.

The useful distinction in meaning attached to the two acronymns TEFL, teaching English as a foreign language, and TESL, teaching English as a second language, does not necessarily imply any difference in teaching methods, but refer, instead to different purposes for which the language is learned, differences of purpose which are ultimately determined by the cultural situations in which the learning is carried on. In TEFL, which probably involves greater numbers of students and teachers than any other language teaching activity in the world today, literary and cultural goals predominate. The TESL situation, by contrast, is one in which the goal is a high level of communicative ability in English, sometimes developed to the point of balanced bilingualism, or even so highly that English substantially replaces the native language. Three common types of ESL situations can be found around the world: (1) English is the language of instruction in other subjects in the schools (as in Ethiopia), (2) English serves as a common tongue among speakers of different languages (as in Nigeria), (3) English is the language of the dominant culture of the region (as for Spanish-speaking minorities in the U.S.). In recent years there has been a dramatic shift of interest and activity from EFL to ESL among American specialists and increased attention to language problems here at home--but apparently without any major decline in American TEFL activities abroad. In this paper I shall

usually use TESL, the preferred term of the ERIC index, to refer to either the entire field (also TESOL), or to second language situations and goals in particular. TEFL will mean foreign language teaching goals.

The teaching of standard English to speakers of non-standard English dialects is another activity which is engaging an increasing number of TESL teachers and specialists through attempts to apply some of the methods of second language teaching to second dialect teaching. The appropriateness and effectiveness of TESL techniques still needs to be worked out, but it has become clear that many adaptations have to be made to fit second dialect situations (20).

My purpose in this paper is to survey what has been done in the past year in the field of TESL as it shows itself in published and unpublished literature, research activities and other information sources, and to attempt to identify educationally significant trends, topics, and needs. The treatment is not intended to be bibliographical nor exhaustive. Rather I hope it will serve as an outline of important present activities and developments and major gaps in our knowledge.

Two brief but comprehensive surveys of American involvement in TESOL over the past dozen years provide much fuller background information about the field than is appropriate in this report. On TEFL activities abroad there is Marckwardt's 1967 paper "Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Survey of the Past Decade" (44). Emphasizing activities at home there is a parallel 1969 report by

Ohannessian on the role of the Center for Applied Linguistics in TESL during approximately the same period: "TESOL Today--A view from the Center" (50). In addition there is a recent state-of-the-art paper by Wardhaugh (77), and also summary reports listing selected United States activities in TESOL prepared for the 1968 and 1969 International Conferences on Second Language Problems, held in Tunisia and Senegal respectively (84, 53).

In the sections that follow I shall first attempt to identify educationally significant trends in TESL today in a survey which at the same time presents a general outline of the field (Section 1). In the next section (Section 2) current topics in TESL will be described and ranked according to an estimate of their importance for research and development now and in the near future. The particular groups of people active in various aspects of TESOL in need of new knowledge on these topics will be indicated.

## 1. TRENDS IN TESL 1969: AN OUTLINE AND EVALUATION

Goals, students, teachers and methods--these are the raw ingredients in any teaching situation. The goals of education must be defined within the social context in which the schools operate; the goals of second language teaching are ultimately determined by the students, their parents and peers, and the community. In this section I will first survey the students and social settings of ESL instruction and the types of goals determined by these settings. Next I will examine current trends in theory, methodology, and research. Finally, the TESL professional will be discussed in relation to his qualifications, training, and supporting professional services.

### 1.1 Instructional settings and learning goals.

The settings in which English is taught today are perhaps the most varied of any language in history. Instruction is carried on both within and outside the schools, among students of all ages, social classes, and levels of schooling, in widely varied societies from the most technologically advanced nations to not yet emergent ones. Exactly how many people are being taught English is not known but the vastness of the total world-wide effort is suggested by two isolated figures: Japan has over 66,000 English teachers; the Soviet Union reports 45 million students in Russian schools study English.

Some idea of both the variety of teaching situations and goals, and also of the range of U.S. activities in TESL abroad can be gained

from a brief examination of the Regional English Language Centre in Singapore which completed its first full year of operation in 1969. Organized under the South East Asian Ministers of Education Council, it is funded in part by both the United States and the United Kingdom. There are seven actively participating S.E. Asian nations. In two of the seven English is generally taught as a second language (Singapore and the Philippines), and in four as a foreign language (Indonesia, Laos, Vietnam and Thailand). In the seventh country (Malaysia) English is taught as a foreign language in some schools and as a second language in others. A somewhat more detailed look at one of the countries, Thailand, illustrates further the variety of teaching that goes on under the rubic of TEFL. Bangkok, for example, boasts one of the largest USIS language centers, the American University Alumni Binational Center, which annually enrolls 6,000 adult students in its English courses. At four universities a program to upgrade English teaching is being led by the University of Pittsburgh with Rockefeller Foundation support. The Ford Foundation has provided a grant toward development of a national English language training center to make basic improvement in English instruction in Thai schools, where the study of English is compulsory after the fifth grade. Private and missionary schools provide English instruction from the beginning grades. The Fulbright/Hays program provides two TEFL specialists at the university level, and Peace Corps volunteers teach English throughout the country. The Defense Language Institute is active with 61 U. S. trained TEFL instructors teaching 6,000 mili-

tary students. In brief, the English student population of Thailand includes people of all ages and educational levels who study English to interact with mono-lingual English speakers, to make use of advances in world technology, and to engage in international economic, governmental and cultural activities. Not the least important is the use of English as a medium of communication throughout South East Asia. Singapore's Minister of Education described the situation in opening RELC's Fourth Regional Seminar on English teaching in June 1969: "The English language has...become the instrument for educational cooperation in a region where English is not the mother tongue of a great majority of its peoples. This illustrates the importance of English as a second language in a multi-lingual situation where each language group is, quite rightly, anxious to preserve its own language and culture. In such a situation, English has the advantage that it is nobody's native tongue, and, at the same time, everybody's common language."

The teaching of English as a foreign language is by no means a recent or novel activity, of course. It has been going on for two or three centuries in various parts of the world. Similarly, teaching English as a second language has occupied Americans for a long time, especially after the massive immigration of non-English speakers in the 19th century. However, a sharp drop in new arrivals after the 1924 Immigration Act, and the apparent assimilation of

all immigrant groups into the English-speaking majority, lead to the widespread melting-pot belief that America had become a monolingual nation. The facts were and are otherwise as many teachers have known all along. Testimony before the House General Sub-Committee on Education in 1967 counted approximately three million non-English speaking students in American schools, but of this number only about one million were receiving English instruction. Although this situation has existed in the Southwest for generations, national recognition of the problem as a special educational challenge has come about only in the past decade. The first national conference of TESOL specialists and teachers was not held until 1964, but thereafter TESOL specialists who had been devoting their efforts to problems of teaching English abroad and to foreign students on American college campuses increasingly joined forces with school teachers throughout the country to help meet the domestic TESL challenge. Meanwhile, the melting-pot myth is slowly fading away, and with it attitudes toward the role of other languages in American society are changing. Increasing arguments for acceptance of a multi-cultural and multi-lingual society, culminating in Congressional recognition of the special educational needs of linguistic minorities (in the Bilingual Education Act of 1967, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), have had the effect of initiating marked changes in ESL instruction in this country.

A number of distinct and very diverse ESL student populations can be identified in America. First there are the foreign

students who continue to flock to our universities, technical schools, and, in smaller numbers, our secondary schools. TESL teaching on college campuses is on the increase according to a 1969 survey which lists English language courses at 299 institutions, an increase of 121 in four years (19). A recent analysis of six surveys of college programs between 1956 and 1967 identifies an increase in the number of instructional levels offered and class hours per week, with wide use of oral-aural texts for lower level classes, but an emphasis on writing and reading skills becoming increasingly important at the advanced levels (17).

However, foreign students and temporary residents are only a fraction of the non-English-speaking population of the U.S. Native-born Americans make up an immensely larger group in need of English language instruction, and yet their special needs have been all too often ignored or, where recognized, they have been met with inadequate, inappropriate, and even self-defeating teaching strategies (72).

Who and where are these students? Accurate data is not available, but most of them are children in school or young adults. They come from homes and communities where English is spoken little or not at all, and their cultural heritage contrasts with the English-speaking culture around them--often radically as in the case of American Indians. Spanish speakers are by far the most numerous; one and a half million Puerto Ricans and a half million Cubans live in urban Miami, New York, and Chicago. They are recent arrivals compared to the Mexican-Americans--

numbering six and a half millions--whose ancestors had brought Spanish to the Southwest and West before English arrived. Eighty percent live in Texas and California and most of the rest in the five states of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Illinois and Ohio; four-fifths live in urban areas. Spanish is usually the Mexican-American child's only language until he enters school, and a majority of the nearly two million school-age children are educationally handicapped by their inadequate English (61).

The second language group in size is Chinese-speaking. In San Francisco, where perhaps 70,000 Chinese speakers live, lack of English is a critical factor in the economic depression which afflicts newly arrived Chinese immigrants (73).

American Indian tribes speak a wide variety of languages including English, frequently a non-standard type of "Reservation English," but adequate information on the language use of Indian communities is not available. Nevertheless, "most Indian students either do not speak English before entering school or are seriously deficient in their knowledge of English." (29) Unlike Spanish and Chinese speakers, the Indians are generally rural although sizable groups live in Chicago and other cities. Like the others, they are poor. And 75% are under 25 years of age.

Goals for second language learning.

Language learning goals are commonly expressed in terms of linguistic performance--usually a measure of ability in any or all of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

But such skill goals are really intermediate to language use goals, since second language learning itself is only a preliminary step toward ultimately non-linguistic goals for the learner and the society. A foreign student may learn English for its "instrumental" use as a tool to acquire other skills or knowledge, or to get a good grade or a better job. But a second language can also be learned for "integrative" purposes, to achieve social integration and mobility--the ability to live in one or two cultures. A learner may have both goals, of course, but unlike the foreign student, those who live permanently in this English-speaking land are not permitted a detached attitude toward the "integrative" purposes of English. Without English there can be no entrance into the wider society.

In separate articles on TESL for the Navajo, Bowen and Wilson emphasize the importance of bilingual and bicultural education to give the student maximum freedom of choice; not only vocational choices but the choice "to remain in his own culture, to pass to the wider culture of Anglo-America, or to keep a foot in both camps." (6) Wilson, reporting his work developing a bilingual curriculum, states as one objective bilingual competence which "should enable the student to function in either his native or Anglo culture, whenever he so chooses." (80) The goals of second language learning truly come from outside the language and the classroom. The real challenge to TESL in America is to realistically define the socio-cultural goals of each community and accurately translate them into linguistic and educational goals for the language learner.

1.2 Theory and method in TESL.

What is second language teaching and learning? What sort of theory is necessary to support it as a discipline? What are the sources of support? Recently there have been complaints about the failure to develop an adequate discipline of language teaching and learning. It is claimed that this failure ultimately results from the influence of descriptive linguistics on both language content and methodology, that is, that the field of TESOL "has been subsumed by other fields, particularly linguistics."(34,36) Making these charges, Johnson urges a theoretical framework for a discipline of TESL that would put into sensible perspective the contributions of each related discipline. Wilson (81, 82) attempts to provide such a framework in which the essential central conponent consists of the strategies of method. To implement the strategies the teacher has available alternative tactics (techniques). Theoretical support from related disciplines constitutes the rationale (approach), the set of assumptions that forms the basis for the hypothesis that the strategies are indeed the appropriate ones. Four disciplines provide the theoretical assumptions: linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and pedagogy.

A. Linguistics

Contemporary approaches to language teaching are so closely attached to linguistic science that it often seems as though language teaching is a sub-division of linguistics (as Johnson complained). Indeed, the term "linguistic method" used as alternative

for audio-lingual method testifies to the closeness of the relationship in the minds of ESL teachers despite repeated disclaimers from linguists themselves that there can be no "linguistic method." Wardhaugh's comments on applications of linguistics in another field, reading, can be legitimately paraphrased by the substitution of ESL for reading: "...there can be no such method as a linguistic method of teaching[ESL]. Although it is possible to make various proposals for using the findings of linguistic research in the teaching of [second languages], these proposals by no means add up to a method of teaching... An adequate method must draw on insights from many other disciplines in addition to linguistics. Linguists are only one group which may have a legitimate interest in the teaching of [English as a second language]." (76) Linguistic descriptions of English are essential as a starting point for the determination of what ought to be taught, but neither the descriptions nor the methodology of linguistics are of much use in determining how to teach English, and they are of even less use in deciding the why, the goals of TESL.

The "revolution" in basic linguistic theory in the past dozen years, which saw structural theory overthrown by transformational-generative theory, has precipitated wide-spread doubts and anxieties among ESL teachers about the validity of the methods which they assumed to be based on structural linguistics. Aware of the change, they keep asking for applications of the new theory to language teaching, but they do not get the sort of answers they had come to expect from structuralism. Instead, they are warned that the genuinely exciting

(to linguists, at least) insights of transformational-generative descriptions of English do not give teachers any way of teaching these insights or even of assessing their truth value (77).

Nevertheless, a number of articles and conference papers in 1969 continue the discussion which began some years ago almost immediately after transformationalism burst on the scene. R. Lakoff (39), writing on "Transformational grammar and language teaching" maintains that the materials writer must use his knowledge of transformational grammar to formulate and verify his intuitions about English syntax, but that he will not use any "transformational rules" in the text itself. However, if the text is "rationalistically" oriented "it will encourage students to ask why sentences are good and bad--and in this sense it will be truly transformational in accordance with the beliefs held by transformational grammarians about the nature and acquisition of language.

As new developments occur in transformational theory their implications are soon taken up. For example, in papers presented at the 1969 TESOL Convention, Jacobs (31) and Long (41) discuss the relationship, if any, if the concepts of deep structure and linguistic universals to language teaching. Regarding universals, Jacobs suggests that "the likenesses between languages and even the universal characteristics are inadequately exploited" in language teaching. He hopes that someday teachers will have a handbook which points out how each language resembles and differs from English, but the facetious date which he proposes for publication of such a booklet (2270!) testifies to

the extremely tentative nature of present linguistic knowledge in this area. Rutherford, author of a "transformational" ESL textbook, speculates on the application of current research in syntax and semantics ("semantax"), one of the research areas in modern linguistics which is "potentially quite useful for applied linguistics" both in the classroom and in contrastive analysis. In particular he focuses on the "performative hypothesis" recently presented by Ross in a still unpublished paper. It suggests, he says, both a method of presentation and an interesting kind of written exercise for constructions containing <u>because</u> clauses which otherwise are a problem in TESL (62).

Finally, the very recently published theories of generative phonology (Chomsky and Halle, 1968) have already attracted the interest of TESL specialists. A few tentative proposals have been advanced for use of the new findings in teaching the English sound system to literate adult ESL students by relating the sound and spelling systems (78). In addition, use of generative phonology is suggested to overcome some deficiencies in phonological contrastive analysis (59).

Contrastive analysis, the comparison of linguistic descriptions of the native and target languages in order to identify probably points of interference and learning difficulty, continues to have strong following dispite scattered assertions that it is in decline pending further testing of applications to its procedures of transformation grammar, especially the concept of surface and deep structure. Numerous articles appeared in 1969 contrasting English for pedagogical purposes with such diverse languages as Tagalog, Cree, Iranian,

Chinese, and Puerto Rican Spanish. Most of them use a basically structuralist approach but transformational influences are appearing. Kessler (37), for example, studied deep and surface structure contrasts in Italian and English. Under a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Center for Applied Linguistics prepared contrastive studies which are especially valuable for teachers of English to speakers of Choctaw, Navajo, and Papago (51). CAL also continued to push forward its English Contrastive Studies Program, most recently by entering into a comprehensive Serbo-Croatian and English project which will involve some forty Yugoslav and American scholars and produce fifty preliminary monographs (42). In West Germany the Project on Applied Contrastive Linguistics (PAKS), is especially interested in developing a theoretical framework employing transformational grammar. Reporting on the project, the director Nickel (48) points out that research in contrastive linguistics is not likely to lead to great change in current teaching methods. Rather, "the aim of contrastive linguistics is to show the necessity for a thorough differentiation of teaching material and to make suggestions how this can be done." Unfortunately, materials writers and textbook publishers have so far made relatively little use of the contrastive studies already available to them. U.S. publishers have understandably been interested in a large heterolinguistic national and international market, but recently increased domestic demand for TESL materials has brought forth texts for Spanish-speaking children in which the special problems of Spanish speakers are supposedly attacked. Evaluations of

the extent to which these materials do in fact attack such problems are lacking so far.

Teachers raise objections to the "negative" connotations of contrastive analyses, which are felt to focus too much on interference (negative transfer) and not enough on facilitation (positive transfer). In fact, however, contrastive analysis predicts both types of transfer, most accurately at present in phonology, less well so in grammar, and so far not very well at all in semantics and cultural matters. Nor does CA provide a reliable heirarchy of difficulties. Error analysis has been suggested as a more direct route to an accurately predictive contrastive analysis (5).

Nemser (47) suggests that contrastive analysis should compare not only native and target languages, but include a learner approximative system which would serve as a reference for the description of learner behavior and thereby improve the utility of the analysis. Another suggestion, from Spalatin (68), maintains that CA can be strengthened and made more useful by basing it on translation equivalence rather than formal correspondence. Proposals such as these and the numerous suggestions made at the 19th Georgetown Round Table (1968) need to be developed more explicitly through actual application and objective evaluation.

In summary, a revolution in linguistics has challenged structuralist assumptions about the nature and system of language which were held to be fundamental to contemporary language teaching methods. As a

result some teaching methods have already been modified. For example, the formerly sacrosanct order of presentation--listening, speaking, reading, writing--is giving way to much earlier introduction of the written language. But there are doubts that the new theories have anything more substantial to offer than the old ones. Lamendella (40) rejects the idea that transformational grammar can serve as a theoretical base for either second language pedagogy or a theory of language acquisition. He claims that the applications of transformational grammar in TESL materials and procedures so far have been superficial misapplications of terminology, and that no actual pedagogical advantage has been taken of the formal structure and categories defined by it.

B. Psycholinguistics.

It is one thing to describe the abstract structure of language and develop theories about such description. It is quite another thing to understand and explain how men learn language. The difference between linguistic and psycholinguistic studies is the difference between the two questions "What is the nature of language?" and "How does someone know a language?" Linguistic description may contribute something to attempts to answer the psycholinguistic question, but even if we accept the extreme viewpoint that linguistics is a branch of cognitive psychology, it is within the larger context of psychology, not linguistics, that explanations of language acquisition and knowledge must be sought. Descriptive linguistics, Lamendella cautions should not be confused with the attempt to understand human

language as a psychological phenomenon; a cognitive theory of language should be concerned with describing people rather than describing languages, and therefore "what is needed in the field of language teaching are not applied linguists but rather applied psychologists." (40) In other words, second language teaching must look to a cognitive theory of language within the field of psycholinguistics for its foundation.

There have also been attempts to look to neurophysiology--to the actual physical processes of the brain--for explanations of first and second language acquisition. Scovel (63) considers the evidence that has been advanced and concludes that the "cerebral dominance" or "lateralization" theory does indeed explain in part the widely observed peenomenon that children seem to learn a second language "easily and without accent" while adults do not. But it applies only to motor activity and thus affects sound patterns but not lexical and syntactic patterns. It follows, he says, that attempts by TESOL teachers to rid their adult students of foreign accent, for example, are futile. Jakobovits, in a more general review of the physiology and psychology of second language learning (32), asserts instead that "there is no neurological evidence to the effect that children are more capable of learning a second language than adults." In any event, the question of an "optimal neurological age" for second language learning is irrelevant for TESL in America. If they have not learned it at home, children begin to learn English as soon as they enter school at the very latest.

Cognitive psychology, on the other hand, appears to offer considerably more to second language pedagogy, although we need to be

skeptical of the many ideas being offered to language teachers today based on rather tentative hypotheses drawn from studies of first (not second) language acquisition. Wardhaugh mentions one general concept with strong implications for TESL that has emerged from these studies: the realization that although children unfailingly learn their first language it cannot be taught to them in any formal way. Thus it seems obvious that improvement in the language classroom ought to be immediately achievable through a change of emphasis and focus from teaching to learning, from the teacher and language content of the course to the student himself (79).

Just such a shift of emphasis is demonstrated in current attacks on audio-lingual habit theory methodology. The behavioristic theory on which the method is based has been rejected as "simplistic and inadequate in the extreme" (32), especially with regard to language acquisition. Attention has shifted to a "new" theory, the cognitive code-learning theory, by which second language learning resultsfrom a process of acquiring conscious understanding and control of the language patterns, largely through study and analysis of rules describing them. Carroll (12), who insisted that these two theories "represent rather fundamental differences in teaching method and style," nevertheless denied that either is linked to any contemporary psychological theory of learning. Cognitive-code theory is simply "a modified, up-to-date grammar translation theory." It seems apparent, however, that the concepts of "linguistic performance" and "linguistic competence" advanced by contemporary transformational-generative

grammarians have played an important part in the "revival" of cognitive-code teaching methods. The competence-performance point of view holds that in order for the speaker-hearer to "perform" his language--that is, actually speak and listen in concrete language use situations--he must internalize knowledge about his language which forms his total linguistic competence. A detailed examination of the notions of linguistic competence and performance and their applications in language teaching was attempted by Muskat-Tabakowska (46).

Audio-lingual habit drills vs. cognitive-code rule learning have already been the subject of considerable research to find out "which is better," but that results have been so inconclusive that, even allowing for numerous faults in the experiments, the most sensible conclusion may be that the two methods are complementary rather than contradictory and can be effectively combined. Whatever the outcome of this argument, justification for such basic procedures in second language teaching as contrastive analysis and step-by-step cumulative ordering of instruction depends on the theory of transfer. Jakobovits, in a perceptive assessment of transfer effects in language learning (33) finds, for example, that surface similarities between related languages are more relevant to learning than deep structure similarities, that a compound setting yields more positive transfer for related languages than a coordinate setting, and that the old debate over explicit teaching of grammatical rules results from confusion between the teacher's expectations of transfer effects and the learners failure to confirm them.

C. Sociolinguistics: bilingualism and biculturalism.

In the past few years there has been a sharp and significant increase in the number and sophistication of sociolinguistic studies, most prominently in the study of social dialects and bilingualism, each of which is the subject of a separate chapter of this report. Shuy, presenting an overview of the relevance of sociolinguistics for language teaching at the 1969 TESOL Convention (65), notes that although the field is new and is just now developing the tools and conceptual framework needed for realistic assessment of the social dimension of language, it is already uncovering knowledge which should add significantly to the theory and practice of language teaching.

The importance of sociolinguistic and bi-cultural studies to second language teaching, especially in the U.S., is underscored by Ulibarri (74): "Lack of teacher awareness regarding the socioculture of the bilingual-bicultural child has been isolated as a main factor in the educational retardation of Mexican-American and Indian-American children." A useful aid to greater awareness is the excellent compilation of articles on sociolinguistic and sociocultural problems in American education which recently appeared as a special issue of the Florida FL Reporter (1 ). Forty-four papers examine a wide range of problems among linguistically and culturally disadvantaged children. A few of the papers deal with questions of what to teach and how to teach it, but the primary focus is on an examination of the problems such differences create for both the minority and majority communities, and for the teachers and students caught between the two.

If we accept Fishman's (24) basic definition of bilingualism--"demonstrated ability to engage in communication via more than one language"--then it follows that all second language teachers are producers of bilinguals and they must take notice of studies of bilingualism because, Fishman continues, "it is their professional responsibility to be interested in what different degrees and kinds of bilingualism do to their pupils--intellectually, emotionally, and attitudinally." Teachers cannot limit themselves to an exclusively linguistic skills definition (listening, speaking, reading, writing) of bilingualism. They must also consider what emphasis to give to various roles such as comprehension (understanding messages from others), production (sending messages to others), and inner speech (talking to oneself). Furthermore, since bilinguals seldom use both languages interchangeably in all social contacts, teachers must determine the formality levels at which to develop bilingualism. Similarly, bilingualism is seldom the same in various domains of interaction: the home and family, work, religion, education, etc. All four of these interrelated contextual aspects of bilingualism must be considered to determine the "bilingual dominance configuration" that the language program wants to create in the students. For example, American Indian students at BIA schools may need, in addition to their tribal language for home and reservation use, two types of English: standard English for the classroom and beyond, and a non-classroom variety of "dormitory English" which they will pick up in interaction with their fellow students. All three languages must be respected in their appropriate domains.

Unfortunately, teacher views of bilingualism are generally one-dimensional and fail to look beyond schoolroom language use to the total linguistic and cultural world of the child.

Language teachers often tell their students that they will master the language only when they begin to "think in the language." But learning to think in a foreign language does not guarantee that the student will think <u>like</u> a native. In order to do that he must observe, comprehend, experience, and assimilate the cultural patterns of the speakers of that language. In other words, it is not enough to achieve linguistic communication; bilinguals must also achieve cross-cultural communication and understanding--they must become bicultural.

EFL teaching abroad, like FL teaching in the U.S. today, partly justifies its existence by the claim that language study results in an understanding of the foreign culture. Most ESL teaching in the U.S. has long been carried on with the goal, stated or not, of enabling (forcing?) non-native speakers to assimilate into American society through "Anglification." "...much of English teaching in the U.S....may be viewed as 'planned language shift'...perhaps the most rapid and most massive example of language shift in world history." (23)

Seelye (64) reviews recent trends in the analysis and teaching of cross-cultural context in MFL programs and concludes that the profession has not paid sufficient attention to ways of effectively teaching and testing culture. Not only have most teachers not had enough training to teach cross-cultural communication and understanding,

they have not achieved such understanding themselves. Few foreign English teachers have ever visited an English-speaking country and even with a great increase in exchange program grants (rather than the present decline) it is probable that few ever will. In homefront TESL the problem is reversed; the teachers have little or no understanding of the Latin-American, Indian-American, or Chinese cultural heritage of their students. Brodie (8) describes an attempt to develop teacher awareness of cultural differences through cultural sensitivity training, while Marquart and Knapp (2) suggest divergent means of promoting bi-culturalism in the ESL class. But realistic teaching procedures must be based on accurate sociological and anthropological information, effective ways of presenting the information, and teachers who themselves understand both cultures.

Meanwhile the impact of bilingual and bicultural studies, combined with the experience of sensitive and concerned educators, has led to experiments in bilingual elementary schooling in which both English and the native language are used as media of instruction. Bilingual education is not a new idea, but such programs were rare in the United States until the passage in 1967 of the Bilingual Eduation Act. By 1969-70, with the Act only partly funded, there were 25,000 children in 78 federally aided bilingual projects, the great majority of them for Spanish speakers (57). In order to make sure that the bilingual project programs accomplish their objectives (to find out if, in fact, such programs are appropriate for the objectives) research and evaluation of ongoing projects is vitally needed.

A social psychological topic that has particularly attracted TESL specialists recently is motivational attitudes toward foreign language learning. Attempts have been made to confirm the belief that student success is related to his motivitation, to specify more meaningfully the sources and elements of learner motiviation, and to establish predictive correlations between attitudes and language learning achievement. Reports on a study of foreign ESL students at an American university by Spolsky (69) and Cowan (15) confirm the importance of the learner's attitude to speakers of the language: "A person learns a language better when he wants to be a member of the group speaking that language." The attitudes studied are those of the individual learner but they reflect and are determined by the attitudes of his teachers, his parents and peers, and the speakers of the target language. Results obtained in an investigation of Defense Language Institute students studying various languages (21), observed changes in motivation as the course of study progressed. Preliminary findings from studies on language acquisition and attitudes in the Philippines provide data from a wider population and age base (66).

Other social factors which affect the learner's progress were brought out by an analysis of a heterogeneous group at an overseas American university by Buckingham and Za'our (11). There were no significant differences in improvement relatable to sex or native language, but Arabic-speaking students who had alreay mastered a second language (French) had a significant advantage over their mono-lingual fellows. This could support either the common "linguistic" notion that after

the first foreign language is mastered others are easy to learn, or it could mean that the first Indo-European language is the main hurdle for Arabic speakers. However, a sociolinguistic explanation suggests itself: in their French schooling the students might have "learned how to learn" in the style in which they were later taught English. This particular study is inadequate to determine the truth, but it seems clear that culturally determined "styles of learning," still largely unstudied, are of great significance for second language teaching. A pioneering BIA conference on "Styles of Learning Among American Indians," organized by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1968, resulted in important proposals for future research (71). Background studies which are proposed are not limited in application to the investigation of learning styles, but are basic to further development of other aspects of the sociolinguistic component in TESL for American Indians. The studies needed include an Indian language census, investigation of Indian beliefs about language and learning, studies of language use and function in their communities, and cross-cultural data on language acquisition.

Rather belated recognition of the importance of parents and peers in forming attitudes and motivation for second language learning has led to strategies for community involvement in ESOL programs (22). It is the community that ultimately determines language teaching goals, as I have already pointed out, but while ESL teachers and the schools have heeded what they understand to be the desires of the dominant English-speaking majority, they have seldom consulted the minority

communities they claim to serve. Recently a committee of the TESOL Association representing minority socio-political concerns insisted "That TESOL must not only recognize the existence of these groups and individuals but must accept as viable and fundamental the concerns of these groups and individuals in terms of specific active representation and leadership." (55) Calls are heard for community involvement in the preparation of teachers, as well as in the operation and organization of educational systems (52).

The conclusion of Spolsky's paper on learner attitudes is worth repeating here: "We are led to note the significance of sociolinguistics to second language pedagogy, for while psycholinguistics will continue to contribute data on how second languages are acquired, it is only when we look at the social dimensions that we start to understand why." (69)

D. Pedagogy.

The contributions of pedagogy as a discipline to second language teaching seem to be ill-defined. ESL specialists turn to linguistics for information about language, to psycholinguistics for explanations of how language is learned, and they extrapolate from both to explain how language should be taught. There appears to be little systematic attempt however, to draw on pedagogical theories in shaping second language courses and second language teaching methods. One of the few TESL specialists to do so in recent publications is Wilson, who attempts to apply certain concepts of Bruner, particularly the major pedagogical criterion of efficiency, that is, the presentation and sequencing of material so that it will most readily and most transferably be learned.

The most direct and fastest route to efficiency in teaching would seem to lie in constant observation and evaluation of actual teaching and learning. Banathay (4) describes a systems paradigm for curriculum development which provides for continuous assessment of the curriculum as it is operating and automatically introduces improvements. Jakobovits also faces the question of the relationship of theory and pedagogical experience in the development of method. After noting the curious paradox that what seems to work best on practical grounds often shouldn't work on theoretical grounds, he advises teachers to stand apart from theoretical controversies (in linguistics and psychology) and avoid appeals to particular theories to justify their practices. Instead, they should "concentrate on developing and constantly using realistic evaluation criteria that would dictate maintaining or altering their activities in accord with the results they achieve." (32)

The establishment of "realistic evaluation criteria" is as difficult as it is important; thus all evaluative techniques so far proposed for foreign language instruction have weaknesses balancing their strengths (27). Fortunately there is now an indication that increasing attention will be given to ESL program evaluation as educational evaluation itself emerges as a field apart from educational research. Interaction between TESOL curriculum developers and the newly established Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs at UCLA has already begun.

Setting proficiency standards for teachers is an integral part of any evaluation program, but criteria established so far focus only on language proficiency and professional training, factors which often do not have a very direct relation to teaching effectiveness (67). Both criteria and methods for evaluating in-class performance need to be developed.

Finally, reference should be made to some encouraging developments in opportunities for interdisciplinary cooperation--pedagogy, linguistics, psychology, et al--brought about by the establishment of regional educational laboratories under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. At least three of the Southwest and South Central laboratories are actively engaged in development of TESL programs and materials. An ESEA grant also funded development of pre-school and kindergarten bilingual curriculum guides which have just been published. (53, 60)

E. Teaching methods and techniques.

Additional trends in TESL methodology can be described separately in connection with three topics: (1) curriculum for specific students, (2) methods for achieving communicative competence and advanced receptive proficiency, and (3) second language testing.

(1) The shift of emphasis to domestic ESL needs has focussed renewed attention on non-academic young adults, the students traditionally served by part-time "immigrant English" or "Americanization" courses. Innovations in instruction for such students include special ESL Centers, and the addition of ESL to vocational training programs. One program

in New York City uses a mobile classroom-language laboratory that travels to workers at their jobs. Television courses are being offered in a number of communities to reach students who cannot attend classes, but the effectiveness of TV instruction in language is especially difficult to evaluate.

A second, much larger domestic group receiving new attention is in the elementary schools and, wherever elementary TESL programs are inadequate, they are found in the secondary schools as well. It is the elementary grade level that demands and is receiving the most attention however. Second language teaching methods for children were little developed in the U.S. before the 1960's when MFL foreign language instruction in the elementary schools (FLES) was widely introduced. But elementary school ESL programs differ considerably from FLES programs: much more time is devoted to English, much higher achievement goals are set, and the children begin ESL at an earlier age. Lack of an orthodox methodology has encouraged teachers, school officials, and curriculum developers to try a wide variety of new approaches, including the introduction of bilingual education programs using both English and the native language as media for instruction. Pre-school ESL instruction has been tried out in Head Start and bilingual kindergarten programs and published materials are now becoming available for use with very young children (60).

Bilingual education curricula generally have the objective of <u>coordinate</u> bilingualism--side-by-side development of both languages for use in the situations appropriate to each--rather than the sort

of compound (or add-a-language) bilingualism developed in most foreign language courses. Consequently new materials and strategies are being developed which aim to "keep the two languages apart" by using a different teacher for each language, using different languages for different school subjects and social situations, establishing language-culture "corners" in the classroom, and attempting to help the student define through use appropriate roles and domains for each language. (80, 56) At least one curriculum guide for bilingual schools is available through ERIC (83), and hopefully more will soon be forthcoming. Few commercially published materials are available so far. (Unfortunately the concepts and objectives of bilingual education often misunderstood: a recent advertisement claims materials which represent "a true bilingual approach" because "all recorded directions and instructions are in Spanish.")

Attempts to define an "ideal" English-Spanish bilingual program (2) in which, for example, instruction is divided half-and-half between the two languages and all subjects are taught in both, are not reflected in actual practices which assign quite different priorities. The fact is that each bilingual situation deserves and requires its own goals and methods, its own "ideal program," attested by sound research and evaluation procedures.

Three perennial problems which continue to trouble teachers at all levels are large classes, heterolinguistic classes, and individual variations in pupil motivation, ability, and progress. Programmed materials and language laboratories represent two attempts to meet the needs of large classes, mixed language backgrounds, and mixed pro-

ficiency, but only one or two programmed ESL courses are commercially available and un-programmed laboratory materials are too slosely tied to the classroom text to allow real individual progression. A device with potential for the future is Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI), a sophisticated means of controlling programmed instruction. A preliminary theoretical investigation of CAI applications in TESOL is underway (10 ), but practical use of the idea seems to be far off.

A more immediate attempt to meet individual pupil differences not only in language proficiency but in learning style is exemplified by the language skills program of the Hawaii Curriculum Center which provides teachers with the widest possible variety of materials, exercises, procedures and teaching aids for each language learning problem (54 ).

(2) Recent attacks on audio-lingual methodology have stemmed not alone from the inadequacy of its habit-theory base, but also from its apparent failure to develop competence in using the manipulative skills which have been drilled for genuine communication. Manipulative pattern practice continues to be necessary for mastery of "mechanical" skills in pronunciation and sentence patterns, especially in overcoming interference from native language transfer (9 ), but more is needed. The situational approach aimed at meaningful conversational interchange has suffered from haphazard arrangement of language patterns in the dialogues which limited their effectiveness for teaching the patterns. Recent suggestions would combine the structural and situational approaches in structured dialogs, directed discourse, or situational grammar drills (13, 43, 25). "Task oriented" exercises represent an attempt to bring students into meaningful interrelationship

with each other (35).

Receptive proficiency--reading and listening comprehension--at an advanced level of competence is perhaps more important for some classes of adult students than fluency in speaking and writing. Reading improvement materials for native speakers may be effective for non-native speakers who are near-native in ability, but more effective procedures and materials are needed to meet the special reading problems of TESL students in the transitional stage (49). Training in listening comprehension in the language laboratory is being tried out (14).

(3) Language testing for ESL has not been entirely satisfactory *despite the fact that the widely* used tests for English as a foreign language for adult speakers represent a highly developed state of the art. According to Upshur there is dissatisfaction "with the quality and range of FL tests available, with the uses to which the tests often are put, and with the ends they are made to serve." (75) Recent ERIC documents report on speech-communication evaluation tests, a close and entrophy analysis procedure, and a test for Navajo children (28, 18, 7). In addition a practical new book on testing for ESL teachers by Harris appeared in 1969 (26).

Interest is shifting from measurement of linguistic-skill performance to the problems of testing communicative competence and overcoming cross-cultural interferences in testing instruments (70, 7 ). Evaluation of cross-cultural learning has continued to receive some attention (85) but it is hindered by the same lack of knowledge that characterizes the <u>teaching</u> of cross-cultural understanding.

1.3 The profession: manpower.

Three important manpower concerns at present are (1) guidelines for teacher qualifications, (2) content and methods of teacher training, and (3) information resources to aid the resolution of these and other problems.

Formal definition of professional qualificiations for teachers moved ahead in 1969 when New Mexico approved criteria for teacher certification in TESOL. The requirements call for evidence of (1) linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical knowledge and understanding with special reference to the Southwest, and (2) college credits in particular areas and courses. The knowledge required under (1) is not specified in detail but it is presumably demonstrated by completion of the courses listed under (2). A planning conference which will ultimately lead to the development of statements of qualifications and guidelines for the preparation of teachers of ESOL was called in the Spring of 1970 by the TESOL Association.

The number of institutions offering degree and certificate programs in TESL continues to increase; the 1969 IIE survey lists 44 (19). Established programs are being upgraded and expanded as they redirect their former attention on TEFL to include TESL and second dialect teaching. Independent departments for TESOL teacher training were established at two universities in 1969 (Indiana University and State University of New York at Cortland. More undergraduate and doctoral programs are available, but the usual offering is at the M.A. level, often as a certificate in connection with a degree in linguistics.

In-service training of experienced teachers at short-term institutes increased sharply as a result of federal support, under NDEA and its successor EPDA, from two in 1964 to 14 summer institutes in 1969, plus 6 academic year institutes and 4 fellowship programs. But the number of programs--which fluctuates with federal appropriations--must still be far short of meeting national training needs. Further, many teachers cannot afford spare time for a summer training course. Short "weekend" workshops within a reasonable distance of their homes are needed.

Determining what kind of training programs are needed, how many, and what they should teach depends on having accurate and up-to-date knowledge of our present manpower and training resources and future needs. (50). To supply such essential data comprehensive surveys are needed to identify the nation's ESL teachers and administrators, their qualifications for the jobs they do, unfilled and potential manpower needs, present training programs and their content, and other matters. Close liaison is needed among school systems, teacher training programs, and the communities that both seek to serve, and among the trainers themselves to define program objectives and to identify effective training methods. For example, are micro-lessons and vidoetape self-observation productive devices for experienced teacher evaluation and in-service training?

Also needed is accurate data about the students--their distribution, their language needs and their learning problems, and about the school programs in which they are enrolled, the communities they come from, and all the agencies involved in their ESL education. Finally, a personnel registry and employment clearinghouse would help guide manpower

resources to meet unfilled needs at home and abroad.

Professional organizations.

In addition to the school systems and other educational organizations which are directly involved in TESL, and the government agencies and foundations which also pay important roles, there are two main professional organizations for TESL and TEFL professionals. ATESL, the Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, is made up of academic people concerned with university foreign student programs. Its membership partly overlaps that of TESOL, "A professional association for those concerned with the teaching of English as a second or foreign language," a larger and more comprehensive organization with a membership representing all levels and aspects of the field. Established in 1966, TESOL gained its first state affiliate organizations in 1969 (in New Mexico, California, New Jersey, Texas, and Puerto Rico), initiated an employment clearinghouse, and undertook other projects. However, it does not yet have sufficient membership to support financially such vitally needed services to the profession as a personnel registry, short-term workshops and consultations, and the gathering and publication of specialized information such as material guides for particular teaching situations. Some of these services have not been available before. Others will be taken over from the Center for Applied Linguistics, which, through its excellent ESOL Program, continues to play a leading role in national and international liaison and communication in the field.

Information sources.

At present the primary journals devoted exclusively to the field are TESOL Quarterly, journal of the TESOL Association, and

English Language Teaching, published in cooperation with the British Council. In addition there is the Journal of English as a Second Language, English Teaching Forum (A USIA publication available to teachers abroad), Workpapers in English as a Second Language, TESOL Newsletter, and English for American Indians. Numerous other language journals at home and abroad publish articles on or relevant to TESL, most notably Language Learning. Two major bibliographic lists were produced in 1969: a list for teachers of Spanish speakers, edited by Ibarra, which contains 406 items from 1945 to 1968 (30), and an international 1967-68 TESOL Bibliography of 535 items compiled by Croft (16). Supplementing them is the 1968 Index to ERIC Documents in Linguistics (86).

Conventions and conferences provide another forum for information interchange and personal contact. The TESOL Convention is the largest national meeting (over 1200 attended the 1969 Chicago convention to hear 75 speakers). The ATESL meeting in connection with the annual NAFSA Convention is the second main meeting. Sessions on ESL and bilingual education are a feature of the NCTE and ACTFL meetings, and TESOL and ATESL affiliates and representatives have organized state and regional meetings.

Only a fraction of the nation's TESL teachers are able to attend each year, but the information produced by the meetings extends far beyond the conference rooms. Many of the papers that are given appear soon afterwards in the journals; others are entered directly into the ERIC document system.

## 2. CURRENT TOPICS IN TESL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

A survey of TESL, or any other educational field, reveals that there are several groups of people actively performing complementary and interrelated roles in the total effort. Classroom teachers comprise the largest group, an indispensable one, but effective teaching is extremely difficult without support from supervisors and administrators of school systems and educational agencies, curriculum developers and materials writers to select and organize the content and its presentation, language testing and curriculum evaluation specialists, and teacher trainers responsible for pre-service and in-service teacher preparation. Some individuals play roles in more than one group, and certain activities, curriculum and materials development in particular, need active participation by members of all groups and from specialists in related disciplines. Current topics in TESL reflect the needs and interests of these groups, separately and in various combinations; needs and interest which in the final analysis reflect--or should reflect--the language learning and other educational needs of the ESL students and communities that are served.

The topics of TESL today can be conveniently assigned to six categories corresponding to the basic disciplines, teaching methodology, professional development, and surveys. The priorities I have assigned to the topics are more or less inversely related to the amount of knowledge applicable to TESL which is available on the topic (for example, sociolinguistic applications, the newest area, is given highest priority). The focus here is on direct applications and development in TESL itself,

but it is understood that advances in second language teaching depend on continued basic research in the disciplines and in interdisciplinary matters. The six categories ranked according to priority (except for the sixth, Surveys, which provides basic data for the others) are these:

I. Sociolinguistics applied in TESL.

II. Psycholinguistics applied in TESL.

III. TESL methodology

IV. Professional development.

V. Applied Linguistics in TESL.

VI. Surveys.

Within each category there is some attempt to order the topics according to my impression of their importance, but importance is relative to the user's need to know, and different topics have different audiences. Only the primary audience affected by each topic is mentioned, but some groups, evaluators and teacher trainers for example, must concern themselves to some degree with nearly all topics. A brief definition of each topic is all that is necessary since each was described more fully in part 1, and its educational significance pointed out there.

I. Sociolinguistics applied in TESL.

a. Bilingualism. Implications and applications of research in bilingualism, including also psycholinguistic aspects. Audience: curriculum specialists and administrators (especially in bilingual education).

b. Styles of learning. Basic research in cognitive styles of ESL student groups, including psycholinguistic aspects, applied to second language learning; implications for TESL methodology. Audience: curriculum specialists, teachers and supervisors, evaluators.

c. Student motivation and attitudes. Further specification of motivation and attitude factors in language learning; investigation of TESL strategies to accommodate these factors. Audience: curriculum and materials specialists, administrators, teachers.

d. Cross-cultural context and the learner. Applications of studies of biculturalism in TESL; development of teaching procedures for promoting cross-cultural understanding. Audience: teachers, curriculum and materials specialists.

e. Cross-cultural awareness and the teacher. Application of insights into biculturalism for the development of teacher sensitivity to cultural differences. Audience: teachers, supervisors and administrators, teacher trainers.

f. Community participation in TESL. Development of channels for active community socio-political involvement in TESL at all stages of the teaching process from planning of curricula and teacher training to classroom support; special attention to linguistic minority communities. Audience: administrators, curriculum specialists, teachers.

II. Psycholinguistics applied in TESL.

a. Cognitive psychology. Application of substantiated research findings in second language learning to TESL methodology: implications of child language and cognitive studies. Audience: curriculum specialists, teachers, supervisors.

b. Language acquisition. Implications for TESL of basic research in second language acquisition. Audience: specialists in curriculum and second language teaching methodology.

c. Bilingualism. Psycholinguistic aspects (see Ia. above).

III. TESL methodology.

a. TESL methodology for children. Development and evaluation of methods and techniques for teaching ESL to young children. Audience: curriculum and materials specialists, teachers, supervisors and administrators.

b. Communicative competence. Development and evaluation of new techniques and procedures to develop genuine communication in ESL in and out of the classroom. Audience: teachers, curriculum and materials specialists.

c. Advanced competence. Development and evaluation of new techniques and procedures to promote advanced competence in ESL approaching near-native ability; special reference to reading and listening comprehension. Audience: materials specialists, teachers.

d. Individualization of instruction. Development and evaluation of methods for adapting ESL instruction and materials to meet the changing needs of individual students and varied teaching situations. Audience: curriculum and materials specialists, teachers, supervisors, administrators.

e. Program evaluation. Criteria and procedures for pre-use and in-use evaluation and improvement of curricula, materials, and teaching methods. Audience: curriculum and materials specialists, supervisors and administrators, educational evaluation specialists.

IV. Professional development.

a. Teacher qualifications and certification. Statements of guidelines for ESL teacher qualifications. Audience: administrators, teacher trainers.

b. Teacher training. Guidelines for teacher preparation and re-training; improved criteria and methods of pre-service and in-service training; special attention to short-term programs. Audience: teacher trainers, supervisors and administrators.

c. Evaluation of teaching and teacher training. Criteria and procedures for evaluation which correlates positively with student performance. Audience: administrators, teacher trainers.

V. Applied linguistics in TESL.

a. Contrastive analysis. Improvement of models and analytical methods for greater reliability in teaching applications; promotion of wider and more effective use of available analyses. Audience: materials specialists, teachers.

b. Linguistic description of English. Applications, with careful evaluation, of advances in linguistic description of English with special (but not exclusive) reference to transformational-generative studies. Audience: material writers.

VI. Surveys: information gathering and dissemination.

a. TESL manpower. Survey of manpower resources and needs among all TESL groups including qualifications, duties, distribution by areas and levels; special attention to teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

b. ESL students. Broad and narrow surveys of student populations to determine local, national, and international distribution, native and second languages and language needs, social and cultural background, etc.

c. Communities. Survey of communities served by, or in need of, ESL programs with reference to roles and domains of English and native language(s), attitudes toward ESL, educational and social expectations affecting TESL. (Closely related to student survey.)

d. Bibliographic surveys. Continuous up-dating of bibliographic resources; assessment of teaching materials available and needed for different groups, levels, and purposes; active dissemination of bibliographic information in forms most usable by those who need it with special attention to the needs of classroom teachers and supervisors.

Part one of this report presented an overview of the field of teaching English as a second language today, with a particular emphasis on U.S. education which reflects the recent shift of attention by TESL specialists to the domestic scene. Main trends in the field were identified and their educational significance discussed. Part two listed those current topics which emerged from the discussion importantly in need of investigation and development now or in the near future. The TESL groups most concerned with each topic were indicated.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) Aarons, Alfred, C., Barbara Y. Gordon and William A. Stewart, editors. Linguistic-Culture Differences and American Education. Special Anthology Issue, The Florida FL Reporter 7.1 (1969). [FFLR]

(2) Andersson, Theodore. What is an ideal English-Spanish bilingual program? FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(3) Anthony, Edward M. and William E. Norris. Method in language teaching. ERIC Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. No. 8, New York: Modern Language Association, 1969.

(4) Banathy, Bela H. Current trends in curricular developments; college curriculum. Britannica review of foreign language education, Vol. 1 (1968).

(5) Banathy, Bela H. and Paul H. Madrasz. Contrastive analysis and error analysis. Journal of English as a Second Language, 4.2 (1969)

(6) Bowen, J. Donald. English usage and language learning among the Navajo. Workpapers in English as a Second Language. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of English, 1967.

(7) Briere, Eugene. ESL testing on the Navajo reservation. TESOL Quarterly 3.1 (1969).

(8) Brodie, John G. Cultural sensitivity training for the teachers of Spanish-speaking children. (1969) (ED 028 418).

(9) Brown, T. Grant. In defense of pattern practice. Language Learning 19.3-4 (1959).

(10) Buckingham, Thomas. Do computers speak our language? Computer assistance for English instruction. Paper given at 1970 TESOL Convention, San Francisco.

(11) Buckingham, Thomas and George I. Za'rour. Some factors affecting improvement in proficiency in English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly 3.1 (1969).

(12) Carroll, John B. The contributions of psycholinguistic theory and educational research to the teaching of foreign languages. In Albert Valdman, ed., Trends in language teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

(13) Cole, Leo. The structured dialogue: an attempt to integrate structural and situational approaches to language teaching. IRAL 7.2 (1969).

(14) Coltharp, Lurline H. Expanding the use of the laboratory. TESOL Quarterly 3.3 (1969)

(15) Cowan, Susie. English proficiency and bicultural attitudes of Japanese students. (1968) (ED 027 529).

(16) Croft, Kenneth. TESOL, 1967-68: a survey. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1970.

(17) Darian, Steven. Trends in EFL teaching at American universities. TESOL Quarterly 3.3 (1969).

(18) Darnell, Donald K. The development of an English language proficiency test of foreign students, using a clozentrophy procedure. (1968) (ED 024 039).

(19) English language and orientation programs in the United States. New York: Institute of International Education, 1969.

(20) Feigenbaum, Irwin. Using foreign language methodology to teach standard English: evaluation and adaptation. FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(21) Fiks, Alfred I. and George H. Brown. Student attitudes and foreign language learning. (1969) (ED028 417).

(22) Finocchiaro, Mary. Bringing the school and the community together. Paper presented at the 1969 TESOL Convention, Chicago.

(23) Fishman, Joshua A. The breadth and depth of English in the United States. FFLR 7.1 (1969)

(24) Fishman, Joshua A. The implications of bilingualism for language teaching and language learning. In Albert Valdman, ed., Trends in language teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

(25) Gregory, O. Dean. Communication and grammar: the situational grammar drill. RELC Report, 1969

(26) Harris, David P. Testing English as a second language. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969

(27) Hatfield, William N. Foreign Language evaluation. Britannica review of foreign language education, Vol. 1 (1968).

(28) Heinberg, Paul. Script of speech-communication evaluation test. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Speech Communication Center, 1969. (ED 026 633).

(29) Hopkins, Thomas R. American Indians and the English language arts. FFLR 7.1 (1969)

(30) Ibarra, Herb. ed. Bibliography of ESL/Bilingual teaching materials. San Diego City Schools, Calif. (ED 028 002).

(31) Jacobs, Roderick A. Linguistic universals and their relevance to TESOL. TESOL Quarterly e.2 (1969).

(32) Jakobovits, Leon A. The physiology and psychology of second language learning. Britannica review of foreign language education, Vol. 1 (1968).

(33) Jakobovits, Leon A. Second language learning and transfer theory: a theoretical assessment. Language Learning 19.1-2 (1969).

(34) Johnson, Francis C. The discipline of teaching English as a second language: a theoretical framework. RELC Report 1969.

(35) Johnson, Francis C. Effective presentation and practice of new units of language in large classes. Paper given at 1969 TESOL Convention, Chicago.

(36) Johnson, Francis C. The failure of the discipline of linguistics in language teaching. Language Learning 19.3-4 (1969).

(37) Kessler, Ann Carolyn, Deep and surface contrasts in English and Italian imperatives. Language Learning 19.1-2 (1969).

(38) Knapp, Donald. Using structure drills to teach cultural understanding. Journal of English as a Second Language, 4.2 (1969).

(39) Lakoff, Robin. Transformational grammar and language teaching. Language Learning 19.1-2 (1969).

(40) Lamendella, John T. On the irrelevance of transformational grammar to second language pedagogy. Language Learning 19.3-4 (1969).

(41) Long, Ralph B. Linguistic universals, deep structure, and English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly 3.2 (1969).

(42) Lotz, John. "The tenth anniversary of the Center for Applied Linguistics." Linguistic Reporter 11.1 (1969).

(43) MacLeish, Andrew. Questions and directed discourse. TESOL Quarterly 2.4 (1968)

(44) Marckwardt, Albert H. Teaching English as a foreign language: a survey of the past decade. Linguistic Reporter, Supplement No. 19 (1967).

(45) Marquardt, William F. Creating empathy through literature between members of the mainstream culture and the disadvantaged learners of the minority cultures. FFLR 7.1 (1969)

(46) Muskat-Tabakowska, Elzbieta. The notions of competence and performance in language teaching. Language Learning 19.1-2 (1969).

(47) Nemser, William. Approximative systems of foreign language learners. (1969) (ED 026 639).

(48) Nickel, Gerhard. The Applied Contrastive Linguistics Project of the University of Stuttgart. Linguistic Reporter 12.1 (1970).

(49) Norris, William E. Teaching English reading at the advanced level: goals, techniques, and procedures. TESOL Quarterly 3.4 (1969).

(50) Ohannessian, Sirarpi. TESOL today--a view from the Center. TESOL Quarterly 3.2 (1969).

(51) Ohannessian, Sirarpi and William W. Gage, editors. Teaching English to speakers of Choctaw, Navajo and Papago: a contrastive approach. United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Curriculum Bulletin No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

(52) Olson, Paul A. A pride of lions: America's cultural communities and the preparation of teachers. Minneapolis: U.S.O.E. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education. (n.d.)

(53) Pedtke, Dorothy A., editor. Teaching English to speakers of other languages. United States activities: 1968. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

(54) Port, Richard J. Teacher tools for individualizing language skills programs. Paper given at 1969 TESOL Convention, Chicago.

(55) Position Paper by the Committee on Socio-Political Concerns of Minority Groups in TESOL. February 1, 1970 (Mimeo).

(56) Povey, John F. Cultural self-expression through English in American Indian schools. FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(57) Projects under the new Bilingual Education Program. Foreign Language Annals, 3.3 (1970).

(58) Report: Regional seminar on new developments in the theory and methods of teaching and learning English. 9-14 June 1969. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional English Language Centre. [RELC Report 1969]

(59) Ritchie, William C. An explanation of phonic interference. Language Learning 18.3-4 (1968)

(60) Robinett, Ralph and Richard Bejamin. Bilingual conceptual development guide--preschool. Michigan oral language series. (1969).

(61) Rodriguez, Armando. "The Mexican-American--Disadvantaged? Ya basta!" FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(62) Rutherford, William E. Implications for ESOL of some recent linguistic research. TESOL Quarterly 3.2 (1969).

(63) Scovel, Tom . Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance. Language Learning 19.3-4 (1969).

(64) Seelye, H. Ned. Analysis and teaching of cross-cultural context. [ Britannica review of foreign language education, Vol. 1 (1968)

(65) Shuy, Roger W. The relevance of sociolinguistics for language teaching. TESOL Quarterly 3.1 (1969).

(66) Sibayan, Bonifacio P. Studies in language acquisition and on attituded on language: their relevance in English language programs. RELC Report 1969.

(67) Smith, Philip D. and Helmut Baranyi. A comparison study on the effectiveness of the traditional and audio-lingual approaches to foreign language instruction utilizing language laboratory equipment. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1968.

(68) Spalatin, Leonardo. Formal correspondence and translation in contrastive analysis. (1969) (ED 025 766)

(69) Spolsky, Bernard. Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. Language Learning 19.3-4 (1969).

(70) Spolsky, Bernard. What does it mean to know a language, or how do you get someone to perform his competence? (1968) (ED 028 411).

(71) Styles of learning among American Indians: an outline for research. Washington, D,C,: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

(72) Tax, Sol and Robert K. Thomas. "Education "for" American Indians: threat or promise?" FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(73) Tucker, Allen C. The Chinese immigrants language handicap: its extent and effects. FFLR 7.1 (1969).

(74) Ulibarri, Horacio. Bilingualism. Britannica review of foreign language education, Vol. 1 (1968).

(75) Upshur, John A.. Introduction: problems and tests. Problems in foreign language testing. Language Learning, Special Issue No. 3 (1968).

(76) Wardhaugh, Ronald. Reading: A linguistic perspective. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1969.

(77) Wardhaugh, Ronald. Teaching English to speakers of other languages the state of the art. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, 1969. TESOL Newsletter 4.1 (1970)

(78) Wardhaugh, Ronald. Teaching pronunciation: sound to spelling and spelling to sound. RELC Report 1969.

(79) Wardhaugh, Ronald. TESOL: Current problems and classroom practices. TESOL Quarterly 3.2 (1969).

(80) Wilson, Robert D. Bilingual education for Navajo students. TESOL Quarterly 3.1 (1969).

(81) Wilson, Robert D. Outline of strategies for teaching a second language. Workpapers in Teaching English as a Second Language. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of English, 1968.

(82) Wilson, Robert D. Rationale for teaching a second language. Workpapers in English as a Second Language. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of English, 1967.

(83) Wilson, Robert, Evelyn Bauer, Eddie Hanson, Jr., Donald Meyer and Louis Michael. Guides for teaching English as a second language to elementary school pupils. (1968) (ED 018 801, ED 018 802 and ED 018 803).

(84) Wineberg, Ruth E., editor. Teaching English to speakers of other languages. United States activities: 1967. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

(85) Yousef, Fathi S. Cross-cultural testing: an aspect of the resistance reaction. Language Learning 18.3-4 (1968).

(86) 1968 index to ERIC documents in linguistics and the uncommonly taught languages and selected bibliography of related titles. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, 1969.